



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,103	09/18/2003	Moon J. Kim	CHA920030023US1	7124
23550	7590	03/14/2006	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC 75 STATE STREET 14TH FL ALBANY, NY 12207			SING, SIMON P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2645		

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,103	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Simon Sing	Art Unit 2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-6, 11-14 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haber et al. US 6,185,536.

1.1 Regarding claims 1, 11 and 19, Haber discloses a system for using user-specific voice data to authorizing a telephone call, comprising:

a setup system (Communication Unit CU, or Control Facility CF) for capturing and storing an authentic user voice sample (speech characteristic model or SCM) (column 2, lines 31-43; column 3, lines 36-44; column 4, lines 20-30);

a comparison system (CU or CF) that compares the user SCM with an inputted voice sample and generating an comparing result (column 7, lines 57-67; column 8, lines 102);

a control system (CU or CF) for controlling access to a telephone device, wherein the control system:

analyzes the comparison result for an initial inputted voice sample received when the telephone call is initiated (column 3, lines 1-10; column 8, lines 3-10); and

periodically analyze comparison results for ongoing inputted voice samples received during the telephone call (column 9, lines 63-67; column 10, lines 1-7. Note: "If an authorized user..." in column 10, line 5 should be "If an unauthorized user...").

1.2 Regarding claims 2-4 and 12-14, Haber teaches terminating the call if voice input does not matched pre-stored voice samples in a memory (column 3, lines 1-10; column 9, line 63 to column 10, line 7).

1.3 Regarding claims 5 and 6, Haber teaches telephones 12, 26, 28, 42, 52 and 54 in figures 1 and 2. It is inherent that a telephone is usable in a conference call.

1.4 Regarding claim 20, Haber teaches wireless phone 12 and 42.

1.5 Regarding claim 21, Haber teaches periodically or continually collecting voice sample for comparison (column 9, lines 63-67; column 10, lines 1-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 7-10 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al. US 6,185,536 in view of Sorensen et al. US 6,810,116.

2.1 Regarding claims 7 and 15, Haber discloses a system for using user-specific voice data to authorizing a telephone call by one of the portable telephones 12 and 42 in figures 1 and 2, comprising:

a setup system (Control Facility CF) for capturing and storing voice sample (speech characteristic model or SCM) of authentic users (column 2, lines 31-43; column 3, lines 36-44; column 4, lines 20-30);

a comparison system (CF) that compares users' SCM with an inputted voice samples and generating an comparing results for multiple users 12 (figure 1) and 42 (figure 2) (column 7, lines 57-67; column 8, lines 1-2);

a control system (CF) for controlling access to the telephone call, wherein the control system:

analyzes the comparison result for an initial inputted voice sample received when the telephone call is initiated (column 3, lines 1-10; column 8, lines 3-10); and

periodically analyze comparison results for ongoing inputted voice samples received during the telephone call (column 9, lines 63-67; column 10, lines 1-7. Note: "If an authorized user..." in column 10, line 5 should be "If an unauthorized user...").

Haber fails to specifically teach that the telephone call is a conference call. However, since Haber's CF controls portable telephones' access to the PSTN, and it is obvious that the telephone call may be a conference call.

In addition, Sorensen teaches setting up a conference call using voice verification to authorize each participant (column 8, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Haber's reference with the teaching of Sorensen so that a telephone call would have been a conference call, because a telephone conference call was well in the art, and such a modification would have enabled a user of telephone 26, 28, 52 or 54 to set up a conference call with two or more portable phones 12 and 42.

2.2 Regarding claims 8-10 and 16-18, Haber teaches terminating the telephone call if voice input does not matched pre-stored voice samples (column 3, lines 1-10; column 9, line 63 to column 10, line 7).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Simon Sing whose telephone number is 571-272-7545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached at 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.



S. Sing

03/02/2006



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600